REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118327 A1 to *Um et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,356 B1 to *Ito et al.* and U.S. Patent No. 5,469,272 to *Kubota et al.*

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 2, 6, and 10 to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Claims 1 -13 are currently pending.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118327 A1 to *Um et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,356 B1 to *Ito et al.* and U.S. Patent No. 5,469,272 to *Kubota et al.* Applicant respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 2, 6, and 10, as amended, Applicant respectfully submits that *Um et al., Ito et al.* and *Kubota et al.*, whether taken singly or combined, does not teach or suggest a combination comprising a header analysis unit that determines whether or not still image file is a still image file that is compressed in a decodable format within the predetermined extension. *Kubota et al.* merely discloses determining whether or not a recorded signal belongs to a certain mode that can be reproduced (Column 21, line 52 – Column 22, line 3). In *Kubota et al.*, no determination is made as to whether an image file is of the format indicated by the predetermined extension but is nevertheless not decodable.

With respect to independent claim 1, as amended, Applicant respectfully submits that *Um et al., Ito et al.* and *Kubota et al.*, whether taken singly or combined, does not teach or suggest a combination comprising a header analysis unit that determines whether or not still image file is a still image file that is compressed in a decodable format to the body within JPG extension. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for reasons similar to those presented above with respect to independent claims 2, 6, and 10, as amended.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither *Um et al., Ito et al.* nor *Kubota et al.*, whether taken singly or combined, does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 2, 6, and 10, as amended. MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that "[t]o establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)." Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 3-5, 7-9, and 11-13 are allowable at least because of their dependence from claims 1, 2, 6, and 10 and the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: November 9, 2007

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202.739.3000
Fax: 202.739.3001